



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,876	01/31/2001	Robert J. Winchester	57005-A-PCT-US/JPW/AJM/AP	7963
7590	03/26/2004		EXAMINER	
Cooper & Dunham LLP 1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036				SCHWADRON, RONALD B
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1644		

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/773,876	WINCHESTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12, 16- 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12, 16, 17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ . |

1. Claims 18 and 19 are under consideration.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS ARGUMENTS

2. The amendment filed 12/24/2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows. The amended abstract that recites "This invention also provides related methods and compositions". The only compositions and methods disclosed in the specification as originally filed are the specific types of compositions and methods that are actually disclosed. There is no support in the specification as originally filed for the recitation of "This invention also provides related methods and compositions".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the . . claimed subject matter", Vas-Cath, Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the applicant had possession at the time of invention of the claimed method.

The instant claims recite use of SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptor positive human or mouse cells. While the claims recite CXCR4 positive human or mouse cells, they encompass human or mouse host cells transfected with CXCR4 from any mammalian species. Thus, the claims encompass use of CXCR4 receptor from any mammalian species. The claims encompass use of SDF-1 from any mammalian species There are at least 4000 known mammalian species. However, the only SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptors that were known in the art or disclosed in the specification are human or mouse SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptors. Thus, the written description provided in the specification is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed inventions. In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, id. at 1240. In the instant case, the specification and prior art disclose SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptors that are human or mouse SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptors while the claims encompass use of said proteins from any mammalian species. The Federal Circuit has held that if an inventor is "unable to envision the detailed constitution of a gene so as to distinguish it from other materials. . .conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred", Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Attention is also directed to the

decision of The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated: The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.

Thus, as we have previously held, a cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name "cDNA," even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by means of the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA. See Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

Regarding applicants comments the instant claims recite use of SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptor positive human or mouse cells. While the claims recite CXCR4 positive human or mouse cells, they encompass human or mouse host cells transfected with CXCR4 from any mammalian species. Thus, the claims encompass use of CXCR4 receptor from any mammalian species. The claims encompass use of SDF-1 from any mammalian species There are at least 4000 known mammalian species. However, the only SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptors that were known in the art or disclosed in the specification are human or mouse SDF-1 and CXCR4 receptors. Thus, the written description provided in the specification is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed inventions.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by D'Apuzzo et al.

D'Apuzzo et al. teach that CXCR4 is the receptor for SDF-1 (see abstract). D'Apuzzo et al. teach that SDF-1 stimulates a B cell response on human B cell lines via interaction with CXCR4 (see Figure 4). D'Apuzzo et al. teach that the addition of anti-CXCR4 antibody blocks SDF-1/CXCR4 mediated B cell responses (see Figure 4 and 1789, first column). Thus D'Apuzzo et al. demonstrate that antiCXCR4 antibody inhibits activation of CXCR4 receptor by SDF-1, wherein the B cell response requires CXCR4 activation (eg. SDF-1/CRCX4 interaction) to take place.

Regarding applicants comments about "normal growth and development" versus "involvement in disease", there is currently no limitation in the claims that recites "involvement in disease". The claims encompass a method that uses normal human cells to screen for an inhibitor of the SDF-1/CXCR4 interaction and D'Apuzzo teach such a method.

7. Claims 18 and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities.

Claim 18, line 1 "and" should read "an". Appropriate correction is required.

8. No claim is allowed.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached on 571 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair>-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RONALD D. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800- 1600

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644